1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA		
2	MIAMI DIVISION CASE NO. 15-20264-CRIMINAL-LENARD		
3			
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Miami, Florida	
5	Plaintiff,	July 27, 2015	
6	VS.	4:03 p.m. to 4:55 p.m.	
7	MIGUEL MORÁN DÍAZ,		
8	Defendant.	Pages 1 to 28	
9			
10	SENTENCING HEARING		
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOAN A. LENARD, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
12			
13	APPEARANCES:		
14			
15	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: MARC ASSIS	ANTON, ESQ. STANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY	
16		ortheast Fourth Street L, Florida 33132	
17			
18		EL ECARIUS, ESQ. STANT FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER	
19	150 7	150 West Flagler Street Miami, Florida 33130	
20	ratum.	1, 11011da 33130	
	FOR US PROBATION: MICH	ELLE BURGESS	
21			
22	Offic	LISA EDWARDS, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter	
23	United States District Court 400 North Miami Avenue Twelfth Floor Miami, Florida 33128		
24			
25	(305)	523-5499	

```
1
             THE COURT: United States of America versus Miguel
 2
     Morán Díaz, Case No. 15-20264.
             Good afternoon, counsel and Probation. State your
 3
     appearances, please, for the record.
 4
 5
             MR. ANTON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Marc Anton on
 6
     behalf of the United States.
 7
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
             MR. ECARIUS: Good afternoon, Judge. Daniel Ecarius
 8
 9
     from the Federal Defender's Office on behalf of Mr. Miguel
10
     Morán Díaz, who's seated next to me.
11
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
12
             THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
13
     Michelle Burgess on behalf of US Probation.
14
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
15
             Mr. Morán Díaz is set for sentencing today.
16
             Mr. Morán, have you read the revised advisory
17
     presentence investigation report and its addendums?
18
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
19
             THE COURT: And have you and your attorney discussed
20
     the advisory presentence investigation report and its
21
     addendums?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
             THE COURT: My examination of the file indicates that
24
     neither the Government nor the Defendant have filed any
25
     objections to the revised advisory presentence investigation
```

```
1
     report and its addendums. And neither side has filed any
 2
     additional motions.
             Is that correct?
 3
             MR. ANTON: That's correct, your Honor.
 4
             MR. ECARIUS: That's correct, your Honor.
 5
 6
             THE COURT: Does the Government make the motion for the
 7
     third level off under 3E1.1?
 8
             MR. ANTON: Yes, your Honor.
                         That motion is granted.
 9
             THE COURT:
             The Court will adopt the factual findings and guideline
10
11
     applications as contained in the revised advisory presentence
12
     investigation report.
13
             Before going further, I would ask counsel to review
14
     with me the major calculations in the revised advisory
15
     presentence investigation report. The offense level is 19; the
16
     criminal history category is Roman Numeral II; the advisory
     guideline range is 33 to 41 months' imprisonment, one to three
17
     years' supervised release; $100 special assessment.
18
19
             Is that correct in its totality?
20
             MR. ANTON: Yes, your Honor.
21
             MR. ECARIUS: Yes, your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: Mr. Morán, you are in court today to
23
     receive your sentence. Before that happens, I must ask you if
24
     there's any legal cause as to why the sentence of the law
25
     should not be imposed upon you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ECARIUS: No legal cause. THE COURT: No legal cause having been shown as to why sentence should not be imposed, the Court will consider whatever you may wish to say in mitigation. Yes, Mr. Ecarius. MR. ECARIUS: Your Honor, I would ask you to consider that Mr. Morán Díaz did accept responsibility promptly in this case. He's certainly very sorry for this situation. He's 45 years old. He's somebody who does have a long work history. He was mostly compliant when he was on supervision last time. I would ask the Court to consider the low end of the guideline range in this case. I think that would be sufficient to punish and deter in this case. Again, he will be on supervised release. There will be someone monitoring him after he's released. I think under the circumstances of this case, that would be appropriate. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Morán, is there something you want to say, sir? THE DEFENDANT:. Yeah. I just want to take this brief opportunity to apologize to the community, to the US Government, my family of course, which is going through a lot right now, without my help. My mother in Cuba is very concerned about my situation. I just want to quarantee it

1 won't happen again, you know. 2 That's it. THE COURT: What does the Government say? 3 MR. ANTON: Judge, it's the Government's position that 4 5 a sentence at the high end of the guideline range is the most 6 appropriate sentence in this case. 7 As your Honor is aware from reviewing the presentence investigation report, this is a Defendant who possesses violent 8 9 beliefs, as evidenced by his Facebook posts regarding ISIS, a known foreign terrorist organization. 10 11 This is a Defendant who wanted to purchase additional 12 firearms from a confidential human source, including a 13 .308-caliber rifle and a Glock handgun. 14 This is a Defendant who bragged about how his 15 collapsible stock rifle was perfect to smuggle into a stadium 16 undetected. This is a Defendant who conducted active surveillance 17 18 of targeting locations in Miramar, Florida, a Homeland Security 19 processing facility. 20 This is a Defendant who indicated his desire to be a 21 lone wolf --THE COURT: Where is that information? I saw that 22 23 information in the detention order, but it was not contained in 24 the report about surveilling the Homeland Security processing 25 facility. And I don't believe it was in the factual proffer.

MR. ANTON: Judge, that information was brought out at the detention hearing as a result of surveillance that was conducted by the FBI. There were undercover observations of the Defendant, along with this source, conducting surveillance at the Homeland Security processing facility in Miramar, Florida. Early on in this investigation, the Defendant had discussed conducting attacks with a potential bomb.

Ultimately, those negotiations or conversations kind of petered out, and the Government was ultimately left with the firearms charge in this particular case. But there was a time over a course of between January and April of 2015 when the Defendant and the undercover source in this particular case were conducting pretty hot-and-heavy active discussions and surveillance regarding an attack here in the United States.

Judge, this is also a Defendant, as I mentioned, who indicated he wanted to be a lone wolf for ISIS. He advocated killing people and inscribing "ISIS" into shell casings. He viewed instructions on bomb making in *Inspire* magazine, which is Al-Qaeda's propaganda magazine.

He was observed actively practicing firing and shooting his weapons. He wanted to buy more ammunition from our source. And during the takedown in this particular case, there was a loaded firearm with 15 rounds in the firearm itself and an additional 15 rounds in a magazine contained on his person.

During a search warrant execution at his residence, the

law enforcement officers found a rifle with 297 more rounds of ammunition.

This is a Defendant who in his criminal history section, Judge, has a prior conviction for carrying a concealed firearm in 1995. Undeterred, he became involved with a conspiracy to possess with intent to deliver over 4 kilos of cocaine and was sentenced to 46 months in 2005.

He was released in 2008, and this offense occurred in January of 2015.

During his confession, he indicated, according to him, that his terroristic threats were a joke, but that he did support the Islamic caliphate, and he did not want to commit any violent acts in the United States.

THE COURT: Where is that in the report? That's the first time I hear any of that. Where is that in the revised advisory presentence report?

MR. ANTON: The portions dealing with the confession, your Honor, is not in the report. That, again, was brought out at the detention hearing.

MR. ECARIUS: Your Honor, I object to that being considered as part of the factual basis for the sentencing.

It's not in the report. I haven't had time to analyze that or respond to that.

THE COURT: I would agree. I'm not going to consider any statements he made or any of the surveillance of the

Homeland Security Processing Center or discussion of attacks regarding bombs other than what's in the revised advisory presentence investigation report.

MR. ANTON: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: It does contain viewing an online magazine and discussions with the confidential source about at least two bombs.

MR. ANTON: Understood, your Honor.

The Defendant was ultimately sentenced to the 46 months on his cocaine conspiracy, released and conducted the instant offense over the course of approximately four months in early 2015.

This is not an individual, your Honor, who is deserving of the low end of the guideline range. This is a violent individual who didn't just simply possess a firearm as a convicted felon.

It's the Government's position that the Defendant's offense conduct in this case was much more serious than a simple possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, especially in light of fact that he had a prior concealed firearm carry back in 1995 and didn't learn his lesson, then again got involved with very serious criminal activity here in federal court and in 2005 and continued his ways by not carrying just one firearm, but possessing two firearms in conjunction with these extremely serious beliefs and actions taken over the

course of four months.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Ecarius?

MR. ECARIUS: Your Honor, I would note that the reason things petered out is because he was being encouraged by the confidential source to go forward and to engage in some kind of terrorist activity. He did not take that bait. He didn't go forward with it. He wasn't interested in that. That's why that case petered out eventually.

He does admit that he had firearms and he was not supposed to have them.

As to his personal beliefs, I'm not going to comment or that.

But, your Honor, I would ask the Court to consider the charges that he has here and the fact that he accepted responsibility for them and that he is -- that the -- that he's here at this time having accepted responsibility.

Thank you.

THE COURT: What I'm going to consider here today is the factual proffer and the relevant offense conduct as contained in the revised advisory presentence investigation report, to which there were no objections. So those facts are taken as true.

Under United States Code, Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a), the Court shall impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set

forth in Paragraph 2 of this subsection.

The Court in determining the particular sentence to be imposed shall consider -- in the Eleventh Circuit in the cases of *United States versus Rosales-Bruno* and *United States versus Shaw* -- and *Rosales-Bruno* is 2015 Westlaw 3825109, a June 19th, 2015, decision; and *United States versus Shaw* is 560 F.3d 1230, a 2009 decision.

And in those decisions, the Eleventh Circuit details how the Court with that language "shall" is required to consider the various factors under 3553, all the factors, including the advisory guidelines.

And in Rosales-Bruno, the Eleventh Circuit stated as follows at Headnote I: "The District Court's task is to impose a sentence that will adequately (1) "reflect the seriousness of the offense; (2) promote respect for the law; (3) provide just punishment; (4) afford adequate deterrence; (5) protect the public from further crimes of the Defendant; and (6) provide the Defendant with any needed training and treatment in the most effective manner."

The task is a holistic endeavor that requires the District Court to consider a variety of factors: (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense; (2) the Defendant's history and characteristics; (3) the kinds of sentences available; (4) the applicable sentencing guideline range; (5) pertinent policy statements of the Sentencing Commission; the

need to provide restitution to any victims; and (6) the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

The Eleventh Circuit goes on to state at Page 4: "As the governing statute makes clear, and as we have explained in an en banc opinion, the advisory guideline range is but one of many considerations that a Court must take into account in exercising its sentencing discretion," citing the en banc decision in United States versus Irey, I-R-E-Y, 612 F.3d. 1160, at 1217, a 2010 decision by the en banc Eleventh Circuit.

And in that decision, Eleventh Circuit goes on to state -- in *United States versus Shaw* to state: "To arrive at an appropriate sentence, the District Court must consider all of the applicable 3553(a) factors." And *Rosales-Bruno* teaches us that the Court can accord and is permitted to attach great weight to one factor over another, and the 3553(a) factors do not have to be given equal weight.

Rosales-Bruno goes on to state that "In assigning weight to the 3553(a) factors as part of the weighing process, a Court may and should consider individualized, particularized specific facts and not merely the guidelines label that can be put on the facts."

And in *United States versus Shaw*, the 2009 decision by the Eleventh Circuit, which is a case that factually is analogous to this case in that that Defendant was charged with possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, his advisory

guideline range was 30 to 37 months' imprisonment; and Judge Moore sentenced him to the statutory maximum.

And in that case, the Eleventh Circuit cited, as do I today, *Gall versus United States*, 552 US 38, 128 Supreme Court, 586, a 2007 decision by the United States Supreme Court. At 1237 and 1238, the Eleventh Circuit stated as follows: "The District Court must evaluate all of the 3553(a) factors when arriving at a sentence, but is permitted to attach great weight to one factor over others.

In assessing the factors, the sentencing Court should remember that each -- this is the quote from *Gall* at 598:

"Each convicted person is an individual and every case is a unique study in the human failings that sometimes mitigate, sometimes magnify the crime and the punishment to ensue."

And the Shaw case goes on at 1238 to state: "When the district court decides after serious consideration that a variance is in order, it should explain why that variance is appropriate in a particular case with sufficient justifications. The justifications must be compelling enough to support the degree of the variance and complete enough to allow meaningful appellate review."

And here, after giving serious consideration to all of the 3553(a) factors, including the advisory guidelines, I find that an upward variance to the statutory maximum of 120 months is the appropriate sentence.

Under 3553(a), the Court first shall consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the Defendant.

The Defendant stands before the Court having pled guilty to felon in possession of a firearm and ammunition under Title 18, United States Code, Section 922(g)(1).

And the nature and circumstances of the offense, as detailed in the offense conduct, the relevant offense conduct in the revised advisory presentence investigation report, revolved around these facts: The FBI launched an investigation of the Defendant who maintained a Facebook page under the name of Azizi al-Hariri. A review of that page revealed numerous postings of ISIS, a known terrorist organization, related articles and a posting showing the Defendant with a firearm.

A confidential source then met with the Defendant and the Defendant introduced himself as Miguel.

The Defendant at that meeting asked the confidential source to purchase a "Baby Glock" for him and discussed with the confidential source that he wished to purchase several weapons and that he would arrange -- the Defendant would arrange to have the weapons stolen from the confidential source's vehicle so the confidential source could claim they were stolen. And he agreed that he would pay the confidential source \$500 in United States currency.

During that first meeting, the Defendant also told the

confidential source that he was a convicted felon and therefore he could not purchase the firearms himself.

The Defendant went on to tell the confidential source that he had multiple weapons, including a rifle he used for hunting in the Everglades, and a Kel-Tec 2000 with a collapsible stock. And he further explained that the Kel-Tec 2000 with the collapsible stock was a perfect firearm because he would be able to hide it in his backpack and then go to a stadium — into a stadium undetected.

He additionally told the confidential source that he possessed a Springfield XD(M) handgun and then showed a picture of himself on his cell phone holding a rifle with a scope, another picture of a rifle with a collapsible stock and green sight that he identified as the Kel-Tec 2000.

He then proceeded to take the confidential source to his vehicle and showed him a gray backpack that was on the front passenger floorboard. He instructed the confidential source to open the backpack and to open his shirt that was inside the second zippered pocket; and wrapped inside that shirt was a loaded handgun, the Springfield XD(M) .40.

So here, we have a Defendant who was charged with one count of possession of a firearm and ammunition. And he was in possession of two guns and over 300 rounds, as the facts detail in the revised advisory presentence investigation report, of .40-caliber ammunition.

On January 30th, the Defendant and the confidential source met again; and the Defendant then instructed the confidential source to enter his vehicle. And the Defendant described himself as a lone wolf for the ISIS group. He went on to state that he wanted to acquire a Savage .308-caliber bolt-action rifle and he was going to scratch "ISIS" in the .308 shell casings. And then he described that after killing people, authorities would find the ISIS-engraved shell casings and know that there was a sniper in town, that he could put the city in checkmate and disrupt the city for a week or two until he was being caught.

Later that same day in the evening, the Defendant and the confidential source viewed a terrorist-inspired magazine website, and the Defendant explained to the confidential source that the magazine provided detailed instructions on how to build bombs.

And then he stated that the Boston bombers found their bomb on this magazine and that was the instructions provided to them, and he showed the confidential source detailed instructions from the magazine on how to construct a car bomb using oxygen and propane tanks as fuel.

On February 8th, 2015, the Defendant and the confidential source met and drove to a remote area of Everglades National Park and exited the vehicle on foot. They both carried backpacks with weapons to an area where they then

proceeded to have shooting practice with the Defendant shooting two weapons, a Springfield XD(M) .40-caliber handgun and a .40-caliber Kel-Tec 2000 rifle with a collapsible stock.

At the Defendant's request, the confidential source used a cellular telephone to record the target shooting.

Then on April 2nd, a search warrant was issued for the Defendant's residence and his car. The Defendant was stopped in his vehicle, and in his waistband was a loaded with 15 rounds of .40-caliber ammunition -- a loaded Springfield XD(M) .40-caliber handgun, and in his pocket was a .40-caliber magazine that was loaded with 15 rounds of .40-caliber ammunition.

The search warrant was then executed on his residence. At the residence, the FBI agents recovered a Kel-Tec 2000 .40-caliber rifle and approximately 297 rounds of .40-caliber ammunition.

The items were recovered from a bedroom that was utilized by the Defendant and contained his personal property and identity documents.

After given his Miranda warnings, the Defendant advised that he was aware that he was not supposed to own or possess weapons due to his prior felony conviction and that he had purchased the weapons from private individuals to avoid scrutiny and purchased the ammunition from local gun stores.

The Court also shall consider the history and

characteristics of the Defendant.

The Defendant is 45 years old. He completed a year of college at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York. His criminal history began over 20 years ago.

On December 29th, 1994, he was adjudicated guilty for petty larceny. And the facts -- when he was 25 years old -- the facts underlying that offense is that he was driving a stolen vehicle. He was given one day of credit time served and adjudicated guilty.

He then was arrested on November 18th, 1995. And on December 20th, 1995, he was adjudicated guilty for carrying a concealed firearm.

He was stopped on a traffic stop. And when he was asked by the Miami Police officer whether he had any weapons, he said yes. A search of the vehicle revealed a 9-millimeter Beretta pistol inside a holster and under the passenger seats. For that offense, he was adjudicated guilty. On December 20th, 1995, he was given six months' probation; and interestingly enough, the probation was terminated on that same day.

He then is arrested again on March 3rd, 2005. And he pleads guilty to conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine before Judge Highsmith in Case No. 05-20216. He receives a sentence of 46 months' imprisonment and three years' supervised release. He's 35 years old.

And the underlying facts in that case were that the

Defendant had purchased 4 kilograms of cocaine with \$30,000 in cash.

The Defendant has continuously worked since he arrived in this country either as a driver or in construction.

The Court also in determining a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary shall consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense.

So here, we have a Defendant who has had several contacts with the criminal justice system. For two of those contacts, he received basically no sentence or very little sentence. And for the conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine, he received a 46-month sentence. And none of those sentences apparently have been sufficient for the Defendant to change his criminal conduct.

The offense conduct here establishes that the Defendant was being inspired by ISIS and terrorist activities; that he had thought out two ways to be a lone wolf: One, he was going to proceed to a stadium with the Kel-Tec 2000 with the collapsible stock and he would utilize that firearm because, with a collapsible stock, it was perfect. He could go into the stadium undetected with the firearm in his backpack.

The second way that he had thought out that he was going to be a lone wolf is that he would disrupt the city for

up to two weeks by killing people, by being a sniper, and the police would find engraved shell casing that he would engrave with the word "ISIS." He would put the city in checkmate.

He also had researched and read online and showed the confidential source about making bombs. He identified the bombs, bombs that were used by the Boston bombers on Patriots Day, and he spoke about and described a car bomb and exactly how car bombs could be made.

This is not his first gun charge. He previously was convicted of carrying a concealed firearm.

And even the 46-month sentence that he received from Judge Highsmith has not deterred him from further crimes.

I find that more punishment is needed to deter the Defendant from further crimes and to promote respect for the law.

The Defendant himself even stated to the confidential source that he knew he was a convicted felon and he couldn't possess a firearm.

I find that a more severe sentence is needed to protect the public. The prior sentences were not enough to stop the Defendant from committing other crimes.

And even though the Defendant was prohibited by law to have firearms and ammunitions, he possessed two firearms, at least two firearms and ammunition, and he thought about how he was going to utilize those firearms to kill a lot of people.

The sentence that I impose -- the Court shall consider the need for the sentence imposed to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct not only of this Defendant, though I found that a more severe sentence is necessary to deter criminal conduct, but other persons who may be considering such conduct.

And I cite various statements that have been made in recent months by James Comey, the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who in a statement before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in Washington, DC, on July 8th, 2015, stated the following:

Quote: "We continue to identify individuals who seek to join the ranks of foreign fighters traveling in support of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, commonly known as ISIL, and also homegrown violent extremists who may aspire to attack the United States from within. These threats remain among the highest priorities for the FBI and the intelligence community as a whole.

"We closely analyze and assess the influence groups like ISIL have on individuals located in the United States who are inspired to commit acts of violence. Whether or not the individuals are affiliated with a foreign terrorist organization and are willing to travel abroad to fight or are inspired by the call to arms to act in their communities, they potentially pose a significant threat to the safety of the United States and United States persons."

"Social media" -- he went on to state, "Social media has allowed groups such as ISIL to use the Internet to spot and assess potential recruits. With the widespread horizontal distribution of social media, terrorists can identify vulnerable individuals of all ages in the United States, spot, access, recruit and radicalize, either to travel or to conduct a homeland attack."

The assistant director of the counterterrorism division for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Michael B. Steinbach, stated on June 3rd, 2015, in a statement before the House Homeland Security Committee, quote: "ISIL continues to disseminate their terrorist message to all social media users, regardless of age. Following other groups, ISIL has advocated for lone wolf attacks."

Exactly how this Defendant identified himself: a lone wolf for ISIS.

Mr. Steinbach also stated on February 26, 2015, in a statement before the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, quote:
"We are concerned about the possibility of homegrown extremists becoming radicalized by information available on the Internet."

Exactly what happened here. The access to the terrorist magazine about building bombs, ISIS-related articles, this Defendant posted on his Facebook page along with photos of himself armed and discussions with the confidential source

about what he wanted to accomplish with the purchase and use of these firearms.

Mr. Steinbach went on to state at that hearing, quote:
"Individuals inspired by foreign terrorist groups could quietly
arm themselves with the expertise and tools to carry out an
attack. Community and world events may trigger one of these
individuals to take action."

And on July 21st, 2015, at the FBI regional office in Salt Lake City, Utah, FBI Director James Comey stated that ISIS is actively recruiting in every state in the nation. And he stated as follows, quote: "What ISIL brings to us is a crowd-sourcing of terrorism using social media in a way that Al-Qaeda never imagined," end quote.

Quote: "Their message is: Travel to the caliphate, their so-called Islamic wonder world. Join us here in Iraq or Syria. And if you can't travel, kill somebody where you are. Kill somebody in uniform, preferably in the military or law enforcement, but just kill somebody," end quote.

He went on to state, quote: "In every state, we have investigations trying to understand where people are on the spectrum, from consumers of this poison to actors on behalf of this organization," end quote.

So here, we have a Defendant who was on the spectrum.

He consumed this poisonous information and he detailed at least his thought process of how he was going to accomplish this and

what he wanted to do while he possessed firearms that he was not allowed to possess as a convicted felon.

The jurisprudence teaches us that the advisory guidelines are but one factor under 3553(a), that the Court shall consider all the 3553(a) factors and in its discretion may accord the appropriate weight to the factors under 3553(a).

I find after considering the individualized, particularized facts underlying the offense conduct and the history and characteristics of the Defendant that the combined force of the other 3553(a) factors are entitled to greater weight than the advisory guideline range.

Those include the seriousness of the offense; the need to protect the public; the need to promote respect for the law; the need to afford adequate deterrence of criminal conduct of this Defendant and other persons who may be considering such conduct; his criminal history, including a prior gun charge and a 46-month sentence for conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine that did not deter the Defendant from further conduct; and the nature and circumstances of the offense here.

Therefore, I find after considering all of the 3553(a) factors under Title 18, including the advisory guideline range, that the appropriate sentence is the statutory maximum in this case. And therefore, I will upwardly vary from the advisory guideline range to the statutory maximum.

If you would stand with your client, please.

The Court has considered the statements of the parties, the revised advisory presentence investigation report, which contains the advisory guidelines, and the statutory factors set forth in Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

It is the finding of the Court that the Defendant is not able to pay a fine, and therefore no fine shall be imposed.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that the Defendant, Miguel Morán Díaz, is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for 120 months.

Upon release from imprisonment, the Defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years.

Within 48 hours of release from the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons, the Defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which he is released.

While on supervised release, the Defendant shall not commit any federal, state or local crimes; he shall be prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous device; he shall not possess a controlled substance; he shall cooperate in the collection of DNA and shall comply with the standard conditions of supervised release that have been adopted by this Court and with the following special conditions:

The Defendant shall submit to a search of his person or

property conducted in a reasonable manner and at a reasonable time by the United States probation officer.

The Defendant shall not possess or use a computer or any access device with access to the Internet at any location without the prior written approval of the United States probation officer.

The Defendant is prohibited from associating with or visiting specific places either online or in person or individuals or groups such as terrorists, members of organizations advocating violence, organized crime, documented members of terrorist organizations or those known to be or frequent either online or in a physical place.

The Defendant shall provide complete access to financial information, including disclosure of all business and personal finances.

At the completion of the Defendant's term of imprisonment, the Defendant shall be surrendered to the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for removal proceedings consistent with the Immigration and Nationality Act.

If the Defendant is removed or if he voluntarily leaves the United States, he shall not reenter the United States without the prior express written permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The term of the supervised release period shall be

nonreporting while the Defendant resides outside the United States.

If the Defendant should receive the prior express written permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security and reenter the United States within the term of the supervised release period, he is to report to the nearest United States Probation Office in the district to which he reenters within 48 hours of his arrival.

It is further ordered that the Defendant shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100, which shall be due immediately.

And there are no remaining counts. Correct?

MR. ANTON: No additional counts, your Honor. That is correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Morán Díaz, it is my duty to inform you, sir, that you have 14 days with which to appeal the judgment and sentence of this Court. Should you desire to appeal and be without funds with which to prosecute an appeal, an attorney will be appointed to represent you in connection with that appeal.

Should you fail to appeal within that 14-day period, it will constitute a waiver of your right to appeal.

It is also my duty to elicit from counsel from both sides fully articulated objections to the Court's finding of facts and conclusions of law as announced at this sentencing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
hearing and to further elicit any objections which either side
may have to the manner in which sentence was imposed in this
case.
        Are there any objections from the Government?
        MR. ANTON: There are no objections from the
Government, your Honor.
        But I would note that there were forfeiture allegations
contained in the indictment. I'd ask that your Honor impose
forfeiture as well.
        THE COURT: Any objection to the motion for forfeiture?
        MR. ECARIUS: No objection.
        THE COURT: It'll be included in the judgment and
commitment order.
        Any objections by the Defendant?
        MR. ECARIUS: Yes, your Honor.
        We object to the upward variance. We don't believe
that it was reasonable in applying the 3553(a) factors.
        And it allowed -- the conduct that was cited was simply
conversation, a lot of which was elicited and encouraged by the
confidential informant to try to encourage Mr. Morán Díaz to do
something more serious.
        And that that's the basis for -- that his -- his
statements are the result of this type of encouragement and
this type of management by the confidential source.
```

And that that is used to enhance him and that's -- that

1 that analysis is not a good basis for the enhancement. 2 And that the sentence is unreasonable under the 3 circumstances. THE COURT: It's noted for the record. 4 The marshal will execute the sentence of the Court. 5 We're in recess in this matter. 6 7 Thank you. Thank you, your Honor. 8 MR. ANTON: 9 (Proceedings concluded.) 10 CERTIFICATE 11 12 I hereby certify that the foregoing is an 13 accurate transcription of the proceedings in the 14 above-entitled matter. 15 16 /s/Lisa Edwards 17 LISA EDWARDS, RDR, CRR DATE Official Court Reporter 18 United States District Court 400 North Miami Avenue, Twelfth Floor 19 Miami, Florida 33128 (305) 523-549920 2.1 22 23 24 25